



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SECOND SIGHT MEDICAL PRODUCTS, INC.
12744 SAN FERNANDO ROAD
BUILDING 3
SYLMAR, CA 91342

COPY MAILED

AUG 07 2006

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS
ON PETITION**

In re Application of
Greenberg, et al.
Application No. 09/658,160
Filed: September 8, 2000
Attorney Docket No. S101-DIV

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed May 3, 2006, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely file a proper reply to the non-final Office action mailed October 30, 2002. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on January 31, 2003. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on May 16, 2003.

The above-identified application has been abandoned for an extended period of time. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting the statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. At 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109) (applicant obligated under 37 CFR 10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 CFR 1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).

Furthermore, it is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must so notify the Office.

The file is being forwarded to Technology Center 3700 for review of the amendment, filed May 3, 2006, *in due course*.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3228.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ed Tannouse', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Edward J. Tannouse
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions/Patent
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy